

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(Sacramento)

----

In re G.M., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

GABRIEL M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

C045369

(Super. Ct. No.  
JD219324)

Appellant, the mother of G.M. (the minor), appeals from the dispositional orders of the juvenile court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 358, 360, subd. (d), 395; further section references are to this code.)<sup>1</sup> She contends the court erred in denying her services

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant's notice of appeal, filed following a proceeding continuing the dispositional hearing, apparently was in response to the filing of an addendum to the social worker's report which changed the recommendation from offering reunification services  
[Continued]

because, in her view, the evidence showed that she was mentally stable and able to care for her child. We shall dismiss the appeal as moot.

In May 2003, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) removed the 21-month-old minor from parental custody after appellant was placed in temporary confinement on a section 5150 hold. The minor was eventually diagnosed as failing to thrive due to neglect. The minor was detained, and in August 2003, the juvenile court found the minor came within the provisions of section 300.

DHHS originally recommended that reunification services be provided to appellant. However, by October 2003, after receipt of three psychological evaluations indicating appellant would be unable to benefit from services and could not reunify with the minor within six months (§ 361.5, subd. (b)(2)), DHHS changed its recommendation to the denial of services.

At the dispositional hearing in November 2003, following argument on whether services should be denied, the juvenile court ordered DHHS to provide a reunification plan for appellant. The court adopted a plan which included mental health treatment and housing assistance.

Appellant contends, based initially upon the addendum report, that the juvenile court erred in denying her services at the

---

to denying reunification services. Because the dispositional order is the judgment and first appealable order in a juvenile dependency case, we construe the notice of appeal to be from the orders entered at the disposition hearing in November 2003. (*In re Tracy Z.* (1987) 195 Cal.App.3d 107, 112.)

dispositional stage. The factual summary in her brief consists of copies of a subsequent DHHS report, filed in January 2004, for the six-month review hearing, which recommends that the court order additional services.

Appellant has confused the recommendations made by DHHS with the actual orders entered by the court at the dispositional hearing. Because she has already received the relief she seeks, there is nothing more that this court can do since any ruling would have no practical effect. (*In re Jessica K.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 1313, 1317.)

Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed as moot. (*Finnie v. Town of Tiburon* (1988) 199 Cal.App.3d 1, 10; *In re Jody R.* (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 1615, 1621.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
SCOTLAND, P.J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
RAYE, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MORRISON, J.